

**MINUTES OF THE RESCHEDULED MEETING OF THE  
EDINA HERITAGE PRESERVATION BOARD  
MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 11, 2006, AT 7:00 P.M.  
EDINA CITY HALL – COMMUNITY ROOM  
4801 WEST 50<sup>TH</sup> STREET**

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** Chairman Bob Kojetin, Marie Thorpe, Chris Rofidal, Arlene Forrest, Laura Benson, and Nancy Scherer

**MEMBERS ABSENT:** Karen Ferrara, Lou Blemaster, and Ian Yue

**STAFF PRESENT:** Joyce Repya, Associate Planner

**OTHERS PRESENT:** Robert Vogel, Preservation Consultant  
Abby Leber, 4507 Drexel Avenue

**I. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES:**

Member Thorpe moved for approval of the minutes from the August 8, 2006 meeting. Member Rofidal seconded the motion. All voted aye. The motion carried.

**II. CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS – Country Club District**

**H-06-4      4507 Drexel Avenue  
Demolish existing detached garage and build a new  
detached garage**

Planner Repya explained that the subject property is located on the east side of the 4500 block of Drexel Avenue. The existing home is a 1925 English Cottage with American Colonial Revival influence. A 2-car detached garage is located in the northeast corner of the lot, accessed by a driveway running along the north property line.

The subject request involves demolishing the existing 377.6 square foot detached garage and building a new, detached garage in its place. The plan illustrates the new structure will maintain a 3 foot rear and side yard setback, the minimum allowed by code. A variance was approved by the City's Zoning Board of Appeals to allow the eave to project 18 inches into the 3 foot setback. The variance was subject to approval of the Certificate of Appropriateness by the Heritage Preservation Board. A new curb cut is not required since the existing driveway will provide access to the proposed garage.

The new 2 stall detached garage is proposed to be 457 square feet in area. The design of the structure is proposed to compliment the architectural style of the home, incorporating stucco walls and an asphalt shingled roof. The height of the proposed garage is shown to be 16.9 feet at the highest peak, and the height at the eave line is proposed to be 8.9 feet; well within the average of 2 stall garages previously approved by the Board. With the construction of the new garage, the lot coverage for the property will be 2,249.3 square feet in area; the maximum allowed by code is 2,250 square feet.

The proponent has provided a breakdown of the heights of the garages and dwellings on either side and behind the subject property. The figures indicate that the proposal is in keeping with the neighborhood.

The Edina Zoning Ordinance requires a minimum 2-car garage in the R-1 zoning district. The proposed 457 square foot detached garage is standard for a 2-car garage.

Planner Repya concluded that the plans provided with subject request clearly illustrate the scale and scope of the project relative to the principle home. Furthermore, the information provided supporting the subject Certificate of Appropriateness meets the requirements of the Zoning Ordinance and the Country Club Plan of Treatment.

The plans indicate that the exterior materials of the new garage will compliment the existing home, and new structure meets the height and lot coverage requirements set out in the Zoning Ordinance, furthermore a variance was approved to allow 18 inches of the eave to project into the required 3 foot setback. Therefore, staff recommends approval of the request to demolish the existing detached garage and replace it with a new detached garage subject to the plans presented.

Chairman Kojetin observed that there is currently a gate across the driveway going into the rear yard and he wondered whether the gate would remain. Abby Leber, owner of the home explained that the gate will be removed.

Member Thorpe stated that she liked the design of the proposed garage, pointing out that it is a good fit. Member Forrest agreed, adding that she liked the details provided. All Board members appreciated that the plan did an excellent job complimenting the house without attempting to create a replica version. Consultant Vogel agreed, explaining that historically, the garage was a utilitarian structure which was more understated than the home. He added that some of the garage plans the Board has seen almost compete with the house.

Member Rofidal then moved to approve the Certificate of Appropriateness to demolish the existing detached garage and build a new detached garage in its place subject to the plans presented. Member Thorpe seconded the motion. All voted aye. The motion carried.

### **III. CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS (COA) SUBMITTAL REQUIREMENTS:**

Planner Repya advised the Board that she received a request from the City Manager, Gordon Hughes for the HPB to review the submittal requirements for Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) applications. Mr. Hughes's request was in response to a resident's concern brought before the City Council regarding the elevation of new home being constructed in the Country Club District at 4608 Bruce Avenue (COA approved by the Board on 3/14/2006). Of particular concern was the fact that the elevation provided at the March HPB meeting which depicted the proposed new house as well as the houses on either side gave one the impression that the homes sat on a relatively even plane; whereas actually, the foundation of the new home is 2.7 feet higher than the home to the south and 1.5 feet higher than the home to the north. The grade difference was provided on the plan, however it does not appear that the plan was drawn to scale.

Ms. Repya explained that upon receiving Mr. Hughes's request, she met with Steve Kirchman, Edina's Chief Building Inspector to evaluate the elevation plans provided to the HPB with the proposal to determine what changes could be made to ensure that the elevations provided depict what will actually be seen.

Mr. Kirchman and Ms. Repya determined that to alleviate confusion regarding the elevations in the future, the elevation requirement should be fine tuned to require exterior elevations drawn to scale of the existing and proposed grade at the house, top of foundation and top of floor. Ms. Repya provided the Board with the following revised requirements for COA applications (revisions highlighted):

**The following information is required to accompany the request for a Certificate of Appropriateness:**

1. Application and \$175.00. Checks made payable to the City of Edina.
2. A meeting is required with the Planner prior to submitting the application.
3. 2 surveys to comply with City requirements (attached) – one of the existing home and one of the proposed home.
4. Detailed exterior elevations of all sides including the following information drawn to scale:
  - Existing and proposed grade at the house
  - Existing and proposed top of foundation
  - Existing and proposed top of floor
5. Exterior elevations of adjacent structures detailing grade as well as the roof and eave lines in relation to the roof and eave lines of the proposed work.
6. One copy of the above required elevations reduced to fit an 11" x 17" sheet.
7. A narrative explaining the proposed project, zeroing in on how the proposal meets the recommended design guidelines.
8. A rendering of the new home shall be made available.

Discussion ensued regarding the difference in the perception of a plan on paper versus the actual construction. All agreed that the issue of concern relates to the

vertical dimensions pertinent to the grade, and it is imperative that all the dimensions provided are to scale and accurate as portrayed.

Responding to a question from the Board as to whether they need to move approval of the revised requirements, Consultant Vogel explained that a motion was not required. The reason the change was brought before the Board was to make sure the HPB was aware of a concern raised regarding the Certificate of Appropriateness that was issued for the newest home being constructed in the Country Club District.

Board members agreed that the added requirement of receiving the existing and proposed grades with COA applications will be beneficial. No formal action was taken.

#### **IV. OTHER BUSINESS:**

##### **A. Information for the Public**

Consultant Vogel provided the Board with samples of brochures and information fact sheets used by the City of Chicago to educate the public on issues relative to their heritage preservation programs. Board members agreed that the brochures were very inviting. All agreed that as they move forward to designing the fact sheet/brochure, borrowing some concepts from Chicago's work would be worthwhile.

##### **B. Country Club District Neighborhood Survey Inquiry**

Member Rofidal asked Planner Repya to update the Board on the latest activities of the neighborhood group from the Country Club District who were interested in surveying their neighbors to identify their opinions regarding the appropriateness and effectiveness of the current guidelines in the District.

Ms. Repya explained that after discussing the proposed survey with Jane Lonnquist, the spokesperson for the group, it became clear that Ms. Lonnquist was unaware that the District had been surveyed in 2001, and many of the questions on that survey were the same as those being considered by her committee. A copy of the 2001 survey with the results was sent to Ms. Lonnquist as well as a chronology of public meetings related to the designation of the District. Nothing further has been heard from the committee. Board members asked Ms. Repya to follow-up with Ms. Lonnquist. No formal action was taken.

##### **C. Resurveying the Country Club District Homes**

Consultant Vogel observed that within the past year several contractors have attempted to present plans for new construction in the Country Club District which have drawn upon architectural element found on several homes from within the

district; however when the elements are combined, they are in essence creating their own architectural styles which are not in keeping with the surrounding neighborhood.

Mr. Vogel pointed out that the architectural styles of the 550 homes in the district were last surveyed in 1980. Since that time enough changes to the exteriors of the homes have occurred that it would probably be wise to resurvey the homes, thus establishing a current architectural base. He added that the initial survey did not take into consideration elevations which we are now finding have quite a bearing when evaluating some projects in the neighborhood. Furthermore, the initial survey identified about a dozen architectural styles, when in reality there are basically four predominant styles found in the district.

Mr. Vogel added that both the Plan of Treatment for the Country Club District and the Historic Context Study recommend resurveying the district in the future – perhaps the future is now.

Following a brief discussion, Board members agreed that it would be a good idea to consider resurveying the Country Club District homes in their 2007 work plan. No formal action was taken.

V.      **NEXT MEETING DATE:**    October 10, 2006

VI.     **ADJOURNMENT:**            8:35 p.m.

**Respectfully submitted,**

*Joyce Repya*